

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,200	MILLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jordan M. Schwartz	2873	

All Participants:

(1) Jordan M. Schwartz.

(2) Andrew M. Douglas.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 16 June 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

11-12, 46-47, 20-21, 23, 25

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The cancellation of claims 20-21 and 23 was authorized by applicant's representative to cancel claims directed to prohibited new matter. Specifically, claims 20-21 and 23 were now dependent from claim 22 which claimed the optic comprising a weave and the claimed "pattern of curvatures", "series of concentric circles" and "pattern of particles" were disclosed as separate embodiments from the weave. The specification did not support embodiments comprising a weave together with the limitations of any of claims 20-21 and 23. The changes to claims 11-12 and 46-47 were discussed and agreed upon to overcome antecedent basis issues. The change to claim 25 was discussed and agreed upon to correct an inadvertent error.